```
1
2
3
4
 5
6
7
8
9
10
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11
                            DISTRICT OF NEVADA
12
13
   RONALD NEAL JOSEPH, SR.,
14
   et al.
15
              Plaintiffs,
                                        2:09-cv-00966-HDM-LRL
16
   VS.
                                        ORDER
17
   LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE )
   DEPARTMENT, et al.
18
              Defendants.
19
20
        Before the court is plaintiffs' "Objection to Magistrate's
21
   Ruling [70 & 72]" (Docket No. 77) construed as a motion for the
22
   district judge to reconsider the magistrate judge's orders (Docket
23
   Nos. 70 and 72) which denied plaintiffs' proposed protective order.
    Defendants have responded (Docket No. 80) and plaintiffs have
24
25
   replied (Docket No. 87).
26
        The court has considered the pleadings and memoranda of the
```

Case 2:09-cv-00966-HDM-LRL Document 89 Filed 03/01/11 Page 1 of 2

parties and other relevant matters of record related to plaintiffs' motion (Docket No. 77). The magistrate judge's rulings (Docket Nos. 70 and 72) are not clearly erroneous, contrary to law and/or an abuse of discretion. See Local Rule IB-1(a); Fed. R. Civ. P. Accordingly, plaintiffs' motion (Docket No. 77) is DENIED and the magistrate judge's rulings (Docket Nos. 70 and 72) are AFFIRMED. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 1st day of March 2011. Howard & Mikilles

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE